TESOL/Applied Linguistics Ed.D. Research Paper

Language socialization: Themes and advances in research

Santoi Leung

Teachers College, Columbia University

This paper reviews the work by researchers employing a language socialization (LS) perspective in attempts to bring social factors into SLA theory. Second language socialization research conceptualizes second language learners as novices being socialized into not only a target language but also a target culture. The paper overviews the theoretical underpinnings of LS and then presents some of the overlapping themes that unite research in the first and second language fields. Recent advances in LS research in the second language field are considered and finally some concluding comments regarding the value of SLS and directions for future research are made.

I. Introduction

Mainstream second language acquisition (SLA) research has been criticized for a lack of attention to the social aspects of language learning (Firth & Wagner, 1997).**[1]** Recently, researchers have begun employing a language socialization (LS) perspective in an attempt to bring social factors into SLA theory. LS seeks to understand the process of becoming a competent member of society through language activity. It stresses the interdependence of the acquisition of language and sociocultural knowledge through interaction**[2]** with a more expert member of the social group. First language socialization research built upon the work of child developmental pragmatics in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1979) and extended the traditional microanalysis of child discourse by linking these interactional processes to more macro factors of cultural beliefs and practices of the socialization context, with the overall objective of producing generalizations regarding local social practices and cultural patterns. Second language socialization (SLS) research seeks to apply this perspective in conceptualizing second language learners (SLLs) as novices being socialized into not only a target language but also a target culture.

This paper begins with a brief overview of the theoretical underpinnings of LS and, in particular, discusses the theory of indexicality at the core of the framework. It then reviews some of the overlapping themes that unite research in the first and second language fields, broadly categorized into research on socialization through language and socialization to use language. **[3]** Recent advances in LS research in the second language (SL) field are considered in Section IV, and finally some concluding comments regarding the value of SLS and directions for future research are made.

II. What is language socialization?

Intersecting theoretical perspectives

The centrality of language practices as a resource for socialization links LS to three main theoretical perspectives. Firstly, LS sees social structures as outcomes of social practices in common with the symbolic interactionist and cognitive orientations in sociology (Bernstein, 1972; Bourdieu, 1977). These have attended to the processes of negotiating relationships, outcomes and meanings, and how new realities and meanings are constructed during such social interaction. Secondly, the interactional aspect of socialization overlaps with sociocognitive theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991) where cognitive structures are outcomes of social interaction with an expert in the zone of proximal development. Language plays a central role in how individuals mediate their interaction with the world. Recent formulations of apprenticeship models also situate human development in sociocultural activity. The concept of guided participation involves collaboration and shared understanding in interdependent goal-directed activity (Rogoff, 1990). Rather than internalizing discrete bodies of abstract knowledge transferable to later situations, learners acquire skills and knowledge through limited peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), i.e., restricted engagement in actual practice with an expert where learners have limited responsibility for the overall task.

Thirdly, LS is closely linked to linguistic anthropological perspectives concerning linguistic relativity and communicative competence. A reformulated Sapir-Whorf hypothesis**[4]** (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996) enables recognition of the congruence of its central ideas with LS, regarding the acquisition of social and language competence, and socialization through language (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a): "The emphasis in language socialization studies is not on how languages as symbolic systems encode local world-views (e.g. as lexical paradigms) and, as such, how acquisition of language (e.g. acquisition of lexical paradigms) entails acquisition of a world view…Rather the emphasis is on language *praxis*, what Sapir called 'fashions of speaking'" (Ochs, 1996, p. 408). In other words, it is the socializing power of participation in language practices, which are socially organized and potentially culturally diverse, that is the focus of the revised concept of linguistic relativity. LS also draws upon ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972, 1974) in conceiving language as a socially situated cultural form. Both perspectives are concerned with communicative competence, i.e., knowing the linguistic and sociolinguistic rules for communication *and* having the cultural knowledge that underlies the context and content of communicative events and processes. However, LS pursues a more developmental perspective with primary interest in *how* a novice acquires the competence to become a member of the community, and specifically, the centrality of language in this *process*.

Fundamental tenets of LS

The interdependence of language and culture

LS is concerned with how persons (novices) become competent members of their community by taking on the appropriate beliefs, feelings and behaviors, and the role of language in this process. The processes of language acquisition and socialization are not developmentally independent but are integrated processes. The LS approach makes two major claims: firstly, "the process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of society" and secondly, "the process of becoming a competent member of society is realized to a large extent through language" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984: Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b). In other words, LS is interested in how novices are *socialized to use language* and *socialized through language* in culturally specific ways.

The focus of *socialization to use language* is on the acquisition of the appropriate uses of language**[5]** as a part of the social competence required to successfully participate as a member of a community. First language researchers have looked at monolingual and monocultural settings (Aukrust & Snow, 1998; Clancy, 1986, 1999; Cook, 1996, 1999; Demuth, 1986; Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin, 1986; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). A significant body of work has looked at the continuity/ discontinuity of expected language behaviors across the different sociocultural contexts of home and school in monolingual but multicultural communities (Boggs, 1985; Heath, 1983, 1994; Philips, 1983) as well as multilingual and multicultural communities (Crago, 1992b; Eisenberg, 1986; Moore, 1999; Paugh, 1999; Poole, 1992; Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez & Shannon, 1994).

Socialization through language examines how language is used as a medium or tool in the socialization process. Language enables a novice to become a competent member of a community by socializing through the content of communication and through language use. Social and cultural competence is developed as novices participate in language practices with more expert members since language practices, both on the level of the particular communicative event and general communicative practices, are culturally structured and organized.

Socialization processes may be either explicit or implicit (Ely & Gleason, 1995; Ochs, 1990). There is some disagreement as to this categorization. Some researchers (e.g. Cook, 1996) appear to see this as parallel to the distinction between socialization to use language and socialization through language. However, such a parallel seems both unnecessary and confusing. Explicit socialization may be directed at both the acquisition of language and sociocultural knowledge e.g., elicited imitation routines (consisting of the modeling of verbal behavior and a directive to the novice to repeat) offer content, manner of participation, social relations and situation knowledge (e.g., Demuth, 1986; Eisenberg, 1986; Kanagy, 1999; Ohta, 1999; Poole, 1982; Schieffelin, 1986). Assertions regarding social norms e.g., "Boys don't cry" are also explicit yet language is certainly being used here as a tool for socialization (Bernstein, 1972). Although explicit socialization is the most salient and researched, "the greatest part of sociocultural information is keyed implicitly, through language use" (Ochs, 1990, p. 291). Implicit socialization is realized in the Indexicality Principle.

The Indexicality Principle

How is information about society and culture encoded in language practices? Language practices can index (i.e. point to or signal) sociocultural information (Ochs, 1990, 1996). By interacting with more expert members in language practices,

novices develop an understanding of sociocultural phenomena. So, socialization is partly "a process of assigning situational, i. e. indexical, meanings to particular forms". This Indexicality Principle is at the heart of LS: indeed, indexical knowledge is seen as "the core of linguistic and cultural competence and is the locus where language acquisition and socialization interface" (Ochs, 1996, p. 414).

The types of sociocultural information that can be indexed at the communicative event level are: affective stance, meaning a mood, attitude, feeling, or disposition: epistemic stance, meaning knowledge or belief including degrees of certainty, commitment to the truth and sources of knowledge: social identity which relates to all aspects of social personae, including roles, relationships, group identities, rank, and status: social act which is socially recognized goal-oriented behavior: and activity which is a sequence of at least two social acts (Ochs, 1996, p. 410). Indexing occurs via a particular form that is used variably according to the sociocultural dimensions of the situation. Through this use, the form (which may be phonological, lexical or syntactic e.g., raised pitch, diminutive affixes, interrogative forms) becomes conventionally associated with particular dimensions and so the use of that form invokes those particular dimensions. A parallel can be drawn with Gumperz's (1983) contextualization cues. Not only can language form and content index sociocultural information at the communicative event level, but also communicative practices themselves are organized reflecting more general systems of social order and cultural knowledge.

It would be simplistic to propose that there is always a direct, one-to-one mapping of linguistic form and situational dimension.**[6]** Firstly, there may not a straightforward interpretation of meaning in that assignment of meaning may not necessarily be the same for all interlocutors. Indexicality is a complex process and there must be room (and mechanisms) for negotiation, clarification and repair. Secondly, indexical meaning may involve more than the presence of one linguistic form alone. An interlocutor may have to consider multiple and/or co-occurring forms, in prior as well as present discourse, and non-vocal signs such as gestures. Thirdly, indexicality may not simply end at one situational domain, i.e., when a particular situational dimension is indexed, this may invoke or entail another dimension. Domains may be linked by members' norms, preferences and expectations. These social and cultural linkages are known as indexical valences (Ochs, 1996, p. 417). Unsurprisingly, given the complexity of indexicality, most studies have only focused on one situational dimension indexed by one (set of) linguistic form(s). A number of linguistic anthropological studies have attempted more complex analyses, considering the entailed situational dimensions indirectly linked through indexical valences but these will not be discussed here since they do not centralize the linguistic aspect (among the exceptions are Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990).

III. First and second language socialization: overlapping themes

Schieffelin & Ochs (1996) propose that "A defining perspective of language socialization research is the pursuit of cultural underpinnings that give meaning to the communicative interactions between expert and novice within and across contexts of situation" (p. 255). So, LS research typically seeks to link the micro-level analysis of discourse with macro-level factors such as the community's social practices, social organization and cultural values. It is this linking of the micro to the macro that distinguishes LS research from language acquisition and developmental pragmatics (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996). This section reviews the major themes uniting L1 and L2 research in socialization through language (categorized according to the situational dimension indexed) and socialization to use language (categorized by the type of language behavior discontinuity).

Socialization through language

Affective stance

An important element of social competence is being able to recognize and express emotions in a culturally appropriate manner. It is not surprising then that the linguistic indexing of affective stance is widespread in all languages in the world (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). Teasing is a significant means in the socialization of affect through language. For a community of working class families in Baltimore, it is important not to display hurt feelings in public: a means of achieving this is to be able to tease others successfully (Miller, 1986) and so caregivers often engage children in teasing to this end. Teasing and shaming are also important socialization tools in Western Samoa (Ochs, 1986), in the Kaluli community of Papua New Guinea (Schieffelin, 1986) and in Mexicano homes in California (Eisenberg, 1986). The Japanese language has been a major area of research in illustrating the potential avenues for the shaping of affect through language: via modeling, explicit instruction and negotiation (Clancy, 1986), morphology (Suzuki, 1999), paraphrasing and rephrasing (Clancy, 1999) and interactional routines (Ohta, 1999).

Epistemic stance

Epistemic stance is a vehicle for competence to be communicated and for the speaker to constitute himself as a relative expert or novice. Ohta's (1991) study focuses on how native speakers (NSs) of Japanese use linguistic markers, e.g., adverbials, sentence final particles, to show the source of the speaker's knowledge or judgement regarding the truth of an utterance, leading to a reduction of responsibility for that utterance, and thereby making it more polite. Ochs (1988) contrasts the minimal grasp clarification style of Samoan caregivers (where the caregiver asks for total repetition of a child's unclear utterance) with the expressed guess style of white middle class American caregivers (where the caregiver expands or interprets the meaning of the utterance herself and so the burden of responsibility does not fall on the child). These differing discourse patterns reflect local beliefs about knowledge (e.g., in Western Samoa the mental states of other individuals are not subject to conjecture since they are beyond the limits of one's knowledge) and provide a socialization context for these beliefs. This exemplifies a valuable contribution of cross-cultural LS research: it has illuminated the non-universality of caregiver registers and interaction styles.

Social identity

The indexing of social identity (including status, roles, and relationships) is complex. The less common means is direct indexicality, e.g., by forms of address (Friedman, 1999) and honorifics (Smith-Hefner, 1988). Cook (1996) suggests that the use of Japanese addressee honorifics (the *masu* form) and their non-honorific counterpart (the plain form) index the disciplined and spontaneous modes of self rather than, as conventionally thought, politeness and nonpoliteness per se. She speculates that movement between the two forms at school and home promotes development in children of the culturally significant concepts in Japanese society of *uchi* (inside) and *soto* (outside). Other lexical items may also key status. In hierarchical Western Samoan society, the verbs *sau* (come) and *alu* (go) index that the speaker is of a higher rank than the addressee (Platt, 1986) and so directives using these verbs are only appropriately addressed to those lower in rank.

However, social identity is usually not explicitly encoded by a linguistic form (Ochs 1993, 1996). It may be through the structure and organization of discourse e.g., the Senegalese strategy change, as children get older, from use of reported speech to prompts by mothers (Rabain-Jamin, 1998). Routines have received significant attention. An interactional routine is a "sequence of exchanges in which one speaker's utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants" (Peters & Boggs, 1986, p. 81). Routines not only specify the content and types of utterance expected, but they also specify who can say what to whom since they incorporate a particular participant structure (Philips, 1983). Participation in routines, then, provides a novice with linguistic input, contributing to code learning, and communicates an appropriate way of interacting given one's social status, role and identity, contributing to sociocultural knowledge (Demuth, 1986; Peters & Boggs, 1986; Poole, 1992; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986; Willet, 1995).

As discussed before, situational dimensions are linked by indexical valences. A particular situational dimension can be seen as being constitutive of another if it entails or invokes that dimension e.g., register variation in the form of indirect vs. direct speech acts, tag questions, and prosody can be used to reflect status and role (Andersen, 1986); wh-questions used by Korean mothers indirectly convey cultural messages regarding the importance of literacy, the value of knowledge and appropriate child behavior (Clancy, 1989). Although in theory any situational dimension can help constitute the meaning of any other situational meaning, Ochs (1996) proposes that affective and epistemic stance are central meaning components of social identity and social acts. This is consistent with the elaborate coding found in many languages for affective and epistemic stance and the less rich systems (of direct indexing) that exist for social identity and social acts.

How are affective and epistemic stance socioculturally and conventionally linked to social identity? Stance may be seen as independent of social identity: members may expect a particular stance of a member who has a particular social identity but the stance itself only points to that identity. The alternative is that stance is constitutive of social identity. Although Ochs does not state a preference in her (1996) analysis, the second perspective appears more appropriate for a number of reasons: the independence perspective seems to imply that core social identity is fixed and static and that perceived variation in social identity is in fact variation in the linked situational dimensions; the constitutive perspective is more coherent within a framework that emphasizes fluidity and the constitutive nature of interaction (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991).

The relationship between social identity and SLA has recently received attention by SLA researchers (see Duff & Uchida, 1997; Hansen & Liu, 1997; McNamara, 1997; Pierce, 1995; Siegal, 1996). However, there is no agreed framework and studies have displayed a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives. The value of indexicality to SL studies is the emphasis on social identity as an inferential outcome and not as an *a priori* given, i.e., the appropriate question is "What kind of social identity is a person attempting to construct in performing this kind of verbal act or expressing this stance?" rather than "How does a person having this social identity speak?" When social identity is treated as an independent variable it is,

by implication, an explanation for language variation, without specification or explanation of why particular linguistic structures are linked to that social identity.

Ochs's (1996) analysis poses a number of questions with regard to the construction of new social identities when NSs cross cultural lines. Her discussion is also appropriate to SLLs: Are L2 structures are used to (re)construct the existing social identity or are L1 structures employed to construct a new social identity or does a combination result in a blended social identity? L2 studies (Crago, 1992b; Crago et al, 1993; Paugh, 1999; Schecter & Bayley, 1997) suggest that blending or adaptation, through some aspect of redefinition of the home culture, does occur.

Social act

Affective and epistemic stance are central meaning components of social acts, e.g., the affective stance of sadness is socioculturally linked to the social act of condolence. So, the linguistic form that directly indexes the affective stance indirectly indexes the social act. Ochs gives the example of a family dinner conversation where the intensifying adverbs ("freezing cold"), interjections ("BU::::RR") and repetition ("these peas are cold, these peas are cold") are linguistic structures that index affective intensity but that also help constitute the act of complaining (1996, p. 421). Similarly, the epistemic verb "know" can be used to index knowledge about a proposition and also be interpreted as a challenge (Goodwin, 1990). Other social acts that have been the subject of research are requests (Li, 2000; Ochs, 1988), and begging (Schieffelin, 1990).

Activity

Activity can be indexed by a variety of language and discourse features, e.g., terms of address or reference, evidentials, tense/aspect, speech-act forms and sequences. Discourse features may range from being highly predictable, e.g., greetings, jokes, teasing, or begging, to much more variable e.g., gossipping, giving explanations or advice. Narratives have been examined through their keying by verbal cues (Heath, 1983a) and how they themselves indirectly index wider cultural values (Aukrust & Snow, 1998). Activity has been investigated in the context of work (Duff, Early & Wong, 2000), and school (Hungarian recitations in Duff, 1995, 1996; oral presentations in Cook, 1999; Morita, 2000).

Socialization to use language

Studies that examine both first and second LS within the same community generally seek to investigate the discontinuity of language behaviors between home and school, and the implications for education in terms of student success or failure and pedagogical practices. Given that communities have culturally specific ways of learning and using languages, school is a form of secondary socialization for many language minority children. This section discusses transparent home-school discontinuity (where the home language can be clearly differentiated from the school language) and opaque home-school discontinuity (where the home language is often deemed a substandard variety of the standard one used at school).

Transparent home-school discontinuity

Despite a number of studies looking at LS in the SL classroom, relatively few consider home community practices in any depth. Studies that primarily focus on the ESL classroom environment with populations of heterogeneous L1 backgrounds will be discussed in Section IV. There are a few exceptions. Crago, in her two-year-long ethnographic study of the communicative interaction of four Inuit children and their families in Arctic Quebec (1992b, 1993), documents how aspects of LS at home e.g., the limited responsiveness to infants' early vocalizations, the expectation of non-participation or non-understanding by children when present in adult talk, and the patterns of learning and teaching situations, are in contrast with communicative interaction patterns at school. Another comparative study is Moore's (1999) examination of the failure of formal French education in Cameroon, in a community where infants are socialized into and acquire multilingual communicative competence of local languages. Moore concludes that the wide range of options for participating in L2 learning in the community is not present in controlled classroom discourse dominated by teacher talk and error correction. Although this particular discrepancy between classroom practices and community norms arises due to the teaching style of an individual teacher, the issue raised of (not) identifying and (not) using the competencies that children bring to school is an important one, and may well be relevant in other sociocultural contexts.

Opaque home-school discontinuity

Research in this area has extensively documented how the discourse patterns and expectations typical of mainstream middle class homes in the US are congruent and continuous with mainstream American educational settings. Heath's seminal work**[7]** (1983b) is a study of how children, in two culturally different rural communities in the Piedmont Carolinas, learn to use language in their homes and communities, and how these patterns of language use impact their academic success. The different construction of the social activities in which children engage, in Trackton (a black working class community) and Roadville (a white working class community), affect the access they have to particular types of oral and written language.

Heath's analysis exposes the limits of the common notion that more talk between parents and children leads to greater school success. Instead, it is the type of talk and not the quantity that is the salient factor. Mainstream black and white townspeople socialize their children into the use of decontextualized language, e.g., by labeling items and events, describing their features, and linking items in one setting to items in another by pointing out similarities in labels, features, uses and functions. Discontinuities may arise for individual mainstream children but not for the group as a whole. Although Roadville children have the ability to employ labels of identification and attribution, they do not develop higher level skills, e.g., to manipulate one aspect of context while holding the others constant. This limited preparation results in success in the initial grades but a gradual falling behind. In contrast to both mainstream and Roadville children, the Trackton children are socialized to learn by listening, observing, practicing and finally participating. However, this learning process does not include talk, time nor space set aside specifically for them. Their abilities to tell stories, employ metaphors, and recognize patterns across items and events do not fit the school defined hierarchy of skill development. By the time the children reach the later grades where such skills are valued, they have already been lost to the discourse of school failure.

These problems arise from the opposing views of social scientists and educators. The realization of the social scientist that language is learned as cultural knowledge (Heath, 1984, 1986), and hence can vary across sociocultural groups, is at odds with the educator's view (which is reflected in the nature of the school curriculum and teaching practices) that all children follow the same developmental path in learning and using language. A similar point is made by Philips in her study of the children of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation: "One problem with our educational system is that a shared developmental sequence in the preschool enculturation of children is assumed, when in fact that developmental sequence may be culturally diverse in ways as yet unacknowledged by curriculum developers" (1983, p. 4). The Indian children are socialized in their homes and communities into a culturally distinctive system of visual and auditory channels of communication, and organization of interaction in terms of participant structure and an individual's control of talk. This system is at odds with the Anglo system found in the classroom, contributing to the general withdrawal over time from classroom interaction by Indian children, and the perception of them by Anglo teachers as non-comprehending and inappropriate in their speech behavior.

This raises an interesting question of whether non-mainstream teachers would be better equipped in terms of congruence of discourse patterns and communicative styles to aid language minority children than mainstream teachers (Delpit, 1995; Mohatt & Erikson, 1981; Van Ness, 1981). Heath and Philips both demonstrate that teachers can be empowered through knowledge of discontinuities in home and school language use to improve the congruence of home and school patterns, and thereby enrich the minority child learning experience. Similarly, Boggs (1985) reports the successful results of a teaching method for improving the reading performance of Hawaiian children. The method shares features with a type of speech event in Hawaiian culture known as the "talk story" in that it has a receptive role for the adult, mutual participation and co-narration, and expresses egalitarian values and promotes solidarity (both important aspects of Hawaiian society).

Although the empirical validity of observed cultural and linguistic differences cannot be denied, the discontinuity perspective has invoked criticism. There is a lack of recognition of agency for minority children (who are seen as controlled and defined by teachers). However, there is a limit to how far agency can be emphasized because often the reality is that agency and resistance may not be possible (Willis, 1977). Arguably, the perspective focuses too closely on cultural differences, overshadowing other factors that impact learning in the school environment, e.g., individual teaching and learning styles, factors such as race, class and ideological structures (Fordham, 1996; Ogbu, 1996). It also has not demonstrated how it could account for language minority groups that experience academic success. In addition, the perspective implicitly suggests that children struggle in their choice of school code over home code. Vasquez et al (1994) posit a reconceptualization of the cultural difference perspective: they present evidence of linguistic and cultural flexibility and adaptability by children in a Mexican immigrant community. The children are exposed to, and interact in, a variety of cultural and linguistic environments within and outside of their community. Language use patterns are not clearly demarcated along ethnic lines as previous research has suggested. In fact, the data suggest similarities in language use and parental involvement by Mexican parents when compared to mainstream white middle class parents.

IV. Advances by second language socialization

The direction of influence in first and second language research has generally been from first language acquisition to second (Foster-Cohen, 1993) as has been the case with LS. However, SL research may in fact provide first language researchers with new and provoking questions, as well as insights into the process of first language acquisition within the same framework (Foster-Cohen, 1999). This section reviews the progress made by SLS research to develop the theoretical

framework to incorporate new aspects and to extend into new directions.

Language socialization as a life-span process

Traditionally the term socialization has been used to examine the process by which children are enculturated into their communities. Later scholars (Wentworth, 1980) distinguished the mutually defining concepts of primary socialization (core in terms of personality development and membership to society) and secondary socialization (the acquisition of new roles for an already socialized member).**[8]** Schieffelin & Ochs's (1986) conceptualization of LS as a process that continues throughout the life-span incorporates elements of primary and secondary socialization. However, first language research has concentrated on the early years of childhood. Moreover, since these studies generally measure competency against an adult norm that appears as a complete and unchanging endpoint, there appears an implicit assumption that LS does not continue to any great extent past childhood. The only major area of secondary LS research is in the context of school but even here, research is heavily biased towards the early grades. SLS research, through the highlighting of NNS problems, has helped increase the saliency of adult or secondary socialization. Researchers have adopted various perspectives. Gee (1990, 1992) makes the distinction between primary Discourses and secondary Discourses. Since Discourses are, in essence, social practices comprising of "words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, social identities, as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes…owned and operated by a socioculturally defined group of people" (1992, p. 107), there is a close parallel between primary Discourses and primary socialization, and secondary Discourses and secondary socialization. Dunn (1999) proposes the linguistic notion of register as an appropriate "lens for examining adult socialization into new communities of practice" (1999, p. 451), since register has traditionally been used to denote specialized varieties of language according to their specific contexts of use.

Double socialization

Secondary socialization has been discussed for adult ESL learners in terms of double socialization. This refers to situations where individuals must contend with not only acquiring general language proficiency skills within a new culture but also specialized discourse types.**[9]** The literature focuses on discourse in two environments: school and work.

Socialization in L2 educational environments

This category of research overlaps to some extent with the work on transparent home-school discontinuity (see Section III). However, as noted before, the discontinuity literature tends to examine the mismatch from a comparative viewpoint of how an individual or group function in terms of language practices in the contrasting environments of home and school. The studies discussed in this section restrict their analyses to the SL classroom.

The LS perspective sees the process of language acquisition as the integrated processes of acquiring code knowledge and sociocultural knowledge. The appropriateness for SL learning may be questioned where learners' knowledge of the cultural norms of use is preceded by, and may never develop as fully as, knowledge of the linguistic code. Research does suggest that the SL classroom can operate as a socializing space in which the target language culture is made available to the learner (Friedman, 1999; Ohta, 1991) and that it is a “crucial agent of language socialization” (Ohta, 1991, p. 234). But what culture is represented and (potentially acquired) in the SL classroom? Is it the culture of the target community or the particular culture of the classroom? Many researchers have reported on the special character of classroom discourse (e.g. Cazden, 1988; Gallimore, 1996; Mehan, 1979). Nevertheless, classrooms themselves are situated in the wider context of society and (much as links exist between the patterns of caregiver-child interaction and societal-wide interaction) the nature of discourse in the classroom, despite its special characteristics, reflects wider society norms, values and beliefs. In evaluating the classroom as an appropriate LS space, Ohta (1999) examines the socialization of alignment and appropriate Japanese interactional style among beginning adult learners of Japanese. The pragmatic development of a student’s expression of alignment in naturalistic classroom discourse is charted over the course of an academic year and the results indicate that over time, through peripheral and active participation in the highly prevalent (and much criticized) Initiation-Response-Follow-up (IRF) routine, development is molded and moves towards the target norm.**[10]** A similar teacher IRF routine is contrasted with a teacher-offer-of-help routine in Poole’s (1992) study. It suggests that the effects of participant structure on discourse patterns in the classroom conveys implicit socialization messages regarding the appropriate recognition of task accomplishment, and the avoidance of the overt display of asymmetry between teacher and students. Interactional greeting, attendance and personal introduction routines are also means of socialization for kindergartners who already possess sociocultural competence in their L1 (Kanagy, 1999).

However, as illustrated in the discontinuity literature, classroom practices can create barriers to successful participation and the SL classroom is no exception. These barriers are particularly prevalent in mixed NS/NNS classrooms. Duff (2000) analyzes the linguistic, sociocultural, epistemic and affective barriers facing NNS Asian students in Canadian mainstream

social studies classes. She highlights the fundamental tension that exists between the teacher's need to engage all students and yet, to ensure the participation of NNSs. While sensitive pedagogy can help NNS students overcome these obstacles (Mohan & Marshall-Smith, 1992; Morita, 2000), studies have presented the variability in NNS student success within the same classroom and given the same L1 (Toohey, 1998; Willet, 1987, 1995), indicating the complexity of the L2 socialization process.

Socialization in L2 work environments

The workplace is a significant sociocultural context where NNSs are socialized into new specialized registers or discourse systems. Training programs for immigrants are a particularly fertile environment for investigating double socialization. Duff, Early & Wong (2000) investigate the socialization of immigrant Canadians participating in a training program for long term resident care aides. Although the subjects were exposed to formal language socialization in the English-for-nursing classes they attended, the study focused on their informal linguistic socialization (Scollon & Scollon, 1995) by examining the subjects in on-going observations, informal guidance and communications during their practical experience in resident homes. **[11]** They find a gap between the training program focus on medical and general language proficiency, and the required actual on-the-job communication skills (particularly nonverbal/body language skills). At another inner city immigrant job training program, Li (2000) traces the requesting behavior of a Chinese immigrant woman using a longitudinal ethnographic case study approach.**[12]** Learning how to make a request is conceptualized as a linguistic and socialization process. The change of the original indirect requesting style towards a different, more direct sociolinguistic norm occurs while acquiring knowledge of the social order, systems of belief and conventions in the workplace. Although there is an attempt to link the more microanalysis of the request behavior and development to more macro concerns, Li warns against the simplicity of inferring a casual relationship. Both studies call for further research in the domain of ESL and work, especially for longitudinal studies in the ethnographic tradition. Despite the emphasis in the studies on informal socialization, they point to the pedagogical usefulness of research in this area for language teaching professionals, training program planners and staff.

Novice - expert relationship

The enormous asymmetry in power and expertise in the adult-child relationship in general, and the parent-child relationship in particular, suggests it has a special role in the socialization of the child (Maccoby, 1992). Although SLLs may also lack expertise in terms of L2 linguistic and sociocultural knowledge, the relative importance of the power differential is variable and certainly much more context dependent. Certainly the nature of the *child* novice-*adult* expert relationship cannot be extrapolated or imported wholesale in its application to SLA. In acknowledgement of this, the conceptualization of the novice-expert relationship in SLS has been adapted and expanded to greater emphasize the notions of bidirectionality, shifting expertise and the moment-by-moment dynamic construction of interaction. Even though socialization has been acknowledged as a reciprocal process**[13]** (Maccoby, 1992; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986; Wentworth, 1980), first language research studies have generally ignored this aspect in their analyses. Instead, they have seen the process as essentially unidirectional. In contrast, SLS has used the notion of bidirectionality to allow for change and innovation in communities of practice. Paugh (1999) reports on how children, in a multilingual Creole community in Dominica, are altering linguistic and cultural patterns by choosing and changing the ways in which the affective marker "ga" is used. However, even the extension of unidirectionality to bidirectionality may not be sufficient to capture the dynamic nature of LS. Cultures and, by implication, LS practices change over time (Crago, 1992a). Indeed, some SLS studies specifically highlight the impact of cultural change on home patterns of communicative interaction.**[14]** Crago, Annahatak, & Ningiurvik (1993) extend the research on home-school discontinuity by investigating how the communicative patterns of a mainstream Anglo school extend into and influence those in Inuit homes, and also, how Inuit families prepare their children for mainstream schooling by adapting or redefining their home communicative patterns, so contributing to the changing face of Inuit culture. Language use patterns that originate in the classroom have the potential to cause or inflate problems in the home (Vasquez et al., 1994). As children acquire English at school (and parents are encouraged to speak English at home if possible), the key means by which parents socialize and enculturate their children is eroded (Wong-Filmore, 1991).

SLS research has started to reconceptualize the novice-expert relationship away from static status-oriented social identities to investigating the socially situated co-construction of novice and expert identity and the interaction between them (Ochs, 1991). Although Jacoby & Gonzales (1991) do not focus on their NNSs participants, their study is insightful in the debate surrounding the traditional dichotomy between novice and expert. They suggest it not only hides the bidirectionality of the socialization process, but also "fails to capture both the complexity of what it means to 'know things' and the dynamic fluidity of expert-novice relations as they are constituted in unfolding interaction" (p. 152). The study examines how expertise can shift to relatively novice members (despite their a *priori* lower status) as a consequence of their specialist knowledge though successful shifting requires recognition and ratification by the other members through a simultaneous constitution of themselves as less expert. Although knowledge and macro-level expert identity for the individual may be cognitively based

(on previous socialization, training and experience), one's status relative to other members' knowledge and identity is collaboratively achieved during interaction. A slightly different perspective is taken by Ruldoph (1994) who looks at the construction of a "positive affect bond" in the interaction between a professor and a graduate student. Despite the presence of NNSs as novices, the above studies do not emphasize the NS-NNS aspect of the interaction. This is not necessarily an oversight in investigating the linguistic aspects of the interactions, given the advanced proficiency levels of the NNSs. Yet the potential misalignment of sociocultural knowledge is not fully examined. There have been relatively few studies on the SL novice-expert relationship. There has been some research on collaborative work between SLLs in the classroom context but this tends to be grounded more in sociocognitive theory.

Membership

Whether the novice is perceived as a member of the community has not been a significant topic of discussion in the first LS literature. The distinction between novice and member, when it arises, seems almost accidental, e.g., "Socialization…is not a uni-directional transaction from *member to novice*" (Ochs, 1996, p. 416, my emphasis). However, in the SL context, the distinction appears a necessary one: there is a difference between participating in and being a member of a community. Except for those who begin learning as children, SLLs may not, as a matter of course, be accepted as fully-fledged members.

Roberts (1998) questions whether novices do eventually arrive at an end point of belonging as experts given that socialization is more than cognitive learning in a social context. Current SLS perspectives are criticized as “overly functionalist”, since “events are not simply opportunities for the transmission of knowledge however indirect” but that they are “also sites where social identities are constructed, where the interactants are positioned and position themselves” (p. 35). Furthermore, this positioning is constrained by wider socio-political factors that may be beyond the immediate control of the individual, e.g., racial and class inequalities, linguistic ideologies, unequal distribution of power and resources. Willet (1995) illustrates how gender and class interact in an ESL first grade classroom to position a male student as a problematic learner, but how the same factors enable three female students to construct desirable social identities and relationships. Similarly, McKay & Wong (1996) describe the reactions of ESL students to the development of linguistic and cultural competence in terms of ambiguity, acceptance or resistance. These studies illustrate the mistakenly optimistic underlying characterization in the majority of LS studies of the "shared, consensual - in a sense, the neutral - character of social life" (Atkinson, 1999) and explicitly underline the complexity of membership in the SL context. In an attempt to capture this complexity, Rampton proposes an interesting analysis of the construct of the expert or, in the SL framework, the native speaker. He distinguishes two elements: expertise and allegiance (1995, p. 339). Expertise is learned, relative, and partial, and to achieve it one must pass through some process of certification. This raises a number of questions that have not yet been satisfactorily addressed in the literature: who decides what expertise is? Does the characterization of it change as the novices progresses?

This touches on another aspect of the direction of socialization: is socialization always towards the assumed (mainstream) target norm? This has been a non-issue in first LS but in SLS the assumption of vertical socialization has been challenged. Rampton (1995) argues that the L2 learner in SLA research is portrayed as being primarily preoccupied with progression along the route towards target language competence. His analysis of language crossing (i.e., code alternation**[15]** by speakers who are not conventionally perceived as members of the SL they employ) suggests that this is not necessarily accurate. This significant study documents lateral socialization: how individuals and groups in situations of multilingual and multicultural diversity may not consider the route to membership and belonging as lying only in the direction of the mainstream, standard English-speaking norm. Indeed, language crossing is interpreted as a means of creating a sense of youth, class and neighborhood community, and a way of overcoming race stratification.

V. Conclusion

Kasper suggests that "language socialization theory has a particularly rich potential for SLA because it is inherently developmental and requires (rather than just allows) establishing links between culture, cognition, and language, between the macro-levels of sociocultural and institutional contexts and the micro-level of discourse" (1997, p. 311). Certainly these are important aspects of language learning that are rich areas for investigation. The recent work on social factors in SLA has tended to concentrate on L2 use rather than L2 acquisition (Long, 1997). Arguably the research to date in SLS is open to the same criticism. Nevertheless, SLS has provided a more holistic view of interaction as communicative practice, and has indicated how this practice is linked to, and impacted by, larger social forces, so adding a new dimension to our understanding of the interrelationship between social context and the acquisition and use of a second language.

This emerging field has led to changing methodology as well as an extension of theory. In first language studies, LS is strongly grounded in ethnographic methodology (Geertz, 1973; Schieffelin, 1979). SLS studies are much more varied in their methods. The majority has used some type of discourse analysis, participant observation, and interviews. Kasper (1997) and Roberts (1998) suggest integrating LS with conversation analysis (CA). However, an unresolved tension exists between their underlying theoretical perspectives. LS's concern with tying the microanalysis of interaction with macro sociocultural and historical factors (while maintaining an emic perspective) is curtailed and impeded by CA's disinterest for contextual factors outside of what is explicitly present in the transcribed data. There has also been criticism that much of SLS work "can rightly be characterized from a discourse analytic perspective as not sufficiently attending to language data" (Poole, 1990, p. 43).

In line with the view that LS is a perspective *on* social interaction rather that a specific *type* of interaction (Ochs, 1996), LS research has moved to looking at interaction outside the strict confines of the L2 field (e.g., Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, examine scientific discourse). Comparative LS research (e.g., Aukrust & Snow, 1998; Yoshimi, 1999) also offers potential for pushing the analysis a step beyond that in cross-cultural pragmatics,**[16]** since the goal is to relate and interpret differences with reference to underlying cultural meanings. It offers an alternative view of what is universal and what is particular regarding communicative practices. The majority of ordinary practices of daily interaction and the linguistic forms that they take are cultural universals, reflecting how many communities share similar ways of socializing their novices. However, a particular communicative practice may differ in the scope, preference and extent of use according to local cultural or community norms as well as having differing cultural significance (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996).

The interdisciplinary nature of LS in terms of the fundamental questions it raises, its theory, and methods challenges researchers to venture into and draw upon the diverse fields of linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Language socialization is a lifelong enterprise experienced by all communities and all people. In attempting to understand how ordinary recurrent language practices enable novices to be inducted into their communities, we may better understand the universal and local interfaces between language and culture: it is surely a challenge worth undertaking.

NOTES

[1] A detailed discussion as to whether a theory of SLA should or should not be concerned with social and sociolinguistic factors as well as psycholinguistic processes is beyond the scope of this paper. For a recent exposition of the opposing sides, see the rejoinders to Firth & Wagner in the Modern Language Journal (Gass, 1998; Hall, 1997; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997; as well as the reply from Firth & Wagner, 1998) and also Tarone (2000) and Young (1999). ☐

[2] Although there is an extensive literature on interaction in SLA (Long, 1983; Pica, 1987), the focus has been on the negotiation of comprehensible input where language is perceived as a product to be acquired rather than a discourse into which novices are socialized. ☐

[3] This paper will not focus on literacy socialization which is mainly concerned with issues such as the argument against a unitary view of literacy, the cultural uses of literacy and the relationship between oral and literate practices (for a concise review see Poole, 1990). ☐

[4] Whorf proposed "that users of markedly different grammars are pointed by their grammars toward different types of observations and different evaluations of externally similar acts of observation, and hence are not equivalent as observers, but must arrive at somewhat different views of the world" (1956, p. 122). A broader perspective is taken by Sapir: "the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group…the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation" (Sapir, 1949, p. 162). The body of work generated by the hypothesis on the effects of linguistic structure on the organization of thought and culture received extensive criticism for its linguistic determinism and the characterization of language users as passive objects shaped by their language use. In contrast, the recent, more intermediate positions taken in psychology, linguistics, and anthropology are concerned with linguistic and cultural diversity situated within the context of universals. ☐

[5] The most coherent explication of the dynamics of grammatical development within an LS framework is by Ochs & Schieffelin (1995). They suggest that grammatical forms are linked to, and hence index, situations of use that are culturally

differentiated and organized. Understanding, acquisition, and production of grammatical forms are therefore not dependent on the rate of use nor the complexity of the form itself but instead, linked to the (mostly implicit) social and cultural norms, expectations and preferences of the community.

[6] Och's analysis (1996) appears to use the terms situational dimension and sociocultural dimension interchangeably.

[7] Although Heath is more broadly identified as an ethnographer of communication, her work here takes an essentially developmental perspective in line with the more recognizable LS proponents.

[8] However, this apparently clear-cut distinction is problematic e.g., when is membership considered complete? Wentworth (1980) suggests that the confusion lies in the use of the same term for the type of socializing practice (e.g. occupational training) as for the presumed psychological state of the novice (e.g. internalization of appropriate beliefs). The proposed solution is to move away from the concepts of primary and secondary socialization and describe socialization in its sociocultural setting e.g. family, educational, occupational socialization, and for the specific characteristics of internalization use, e.g. childhood, adolescent or adult.

[9] This term could be considered redundant or even somewhat misleading, given that in this framework language is perceived as not being learned in isolation nor outside of the context in which it is used. However, the term is useful in drawing attention to the particular difficulties NNSs face, and is helpful in distinguishing LS studies that investigate double socialization and those that concentrate on, e.g., novice-expert discourse.

[10] That LS is obviously not a rapid process has implications for methodology. If LS is to be used as a framework for second language acquisition, and not just use, then more longitudinal work of this nature is necessary.

[11] Unfortunately the researchers were not granted access to the classrooms nor clinical settings, and so were unable to directly observe: most of the data came from student and staff interviews.

[12] In contrast to Duff, Early & Wong's study, Li presents a broader data set. The data sources include audio recordings of daily interactions in the classroom, at the workplace and in the community, researcher's journals, subjects' journals, ESL essays and formal and informal oral interviews.

[13] Children play an active role in socializing their parents and younger siblings.

[14] A first language study to do this is Heath's (1994) follow-up to her 1983 study. Two of the Trackton children are traced into adult life to illustrate how patterns of LS can be disrupted or altered beyond recognition in the face of externally imposed social changes.

[15] This is an out-group phenomenon as opposed to code-switching which is an in-group phenomenon. Schieffelin (1994) and Rymes (1997) examine code switching in the LS framework.

[16] This has implications for transfer, which has long been discussed in the SLA field (see for example, Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990 for pragmatic transfer in refusals).

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (1999). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*, 625-654

Andersen, E. S. (1986). The acquisition of register variation in Anglo-American children. In B. B. Schieffelin & *E. Ochs (Eds.), Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 153-161). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Aukrust, V. G., & Snow, C. E. (1998). Narratives and explanations during mealtime conversations in Norway and the U.S. *Language in Society, 27*, 221-246.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella et al. *(Eds.), Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Bernstein, B. (1972). A sociolinguistic approach to socialization with some reference to educability. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: Ethnography of communication* (pp. 465-497). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Boggs, S. T. (1985). *Speaking, relating and learning: A study of Hawaiian children at home and at school*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bordieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NJ:Heinemann.

Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs *(Eds.), Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Clancy, P. M. (1989). A case study in language socialization: Korean wh-questions. *Discourse Processes, 12*, 169-191.

Clancy, P. M. (1999). The socialization of affect in Japanese mother-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1397-1421.

Cook H. M. (1996). Japanese language socialization: Indexing the modes of self. *Discourse Processes, 22, 171-197.*

Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1443-1465.

Crago, M. B. (1992a). Ethnography and language socialization: A cross-cultural perspective. *Topics in Language Disorders, 12*, 28-39.

Crago, M. B. (1992b). The sociocultural interface of communicative interaction and L2 acquisition: An Inuit example. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 487-506.

Crago, M. B., Annahatak, B., & Ningiuruvik, L. (1993). Changing patterns of language socialization in Inuit homes. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 24*, 205-223.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Demuth, K. (1986). Prompting routines in the language socialization of Basotho children. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 51-79). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 505-537.

Duff, P. (1996). Different languages, different practices: Socialization of discourse competence in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 407-433). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. (2000). Language socialization in mainstream content-based discussions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, BC, March, 2000.

Duff, P., Early, M., & Wong, F-P. (2000). Learning language for work and life: The linguistic socialization of

immigrant Canadians seeking careers in healthcare. Unpublished manuscript.

Duff, P., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities end practices in post-secondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly 31*, 451-486.

Dunn, C. D. (1999). Toward the study of communicative development as a life-span process. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *30*, 451-454.

Eisenberg, A. R. (1986). Teasing: verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 182-198). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ely, R., & Gleason, J.B (1995). Socialization across contexts In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *Handbook of child language* (pp. 251 -270). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA *research. Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 285-300.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1998). SLA property: No trespassing! *Modern Language Journal*, *82*, 91-94.

Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity, and success at Capital High*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster-Cohen, S. H. (1993). Directions of influence in first and second language acquisition research. *Second Language Research*, *9*, 140-152.

Foster-Cohen, S. H. (1999). SLA and first language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *19*, 3-21.

Friedman, D. A. (1999). Teasing as pedagogy in a Russian as a Foreign Language class. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Stamford, CT, March, 1999.

Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be. A Response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *82*, 83-90.

Gallimore, R. (1996). Classrooms are just another cultural activity. In D. L. Speece & B. K. Keogh (Eds.), *Research on classroom ecologies: Implications for the inclusion of children with learning disabilities* (pp. 229-250). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Falmer Press.

Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Goodwin, M. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1983). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz. J., & Levinson. S. (1996). Introduction: Linguistic relativity re-examined. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. K. (1997). A consideration of SLA as a theory of practice: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 301-306.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (1997). Social identity and language: Theoretical and methodological issues. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 567-576.

Heath, S. B. (1983a). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, *11*, 49-76.

Heath, S. B. (1983b). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1984). Linguistics and education. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 13*, 251-274.

Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In *Beyond language*: *Social and cultural factors* i*n schooling language minority children* (pp. 143-186). (Developed by the Bilingual Education Office, California State Department, Sacramento.) Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centre.

Heath, S. B. (1994). The children of Trackton's children: Spoken and written language in social change. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 208-230). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: Ethnography of communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*, 148-181.

Kanagy, R. (1999). Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an *immersion context. Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1467-1492.

Kasper, G. (1997). "A" stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 307-312.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. Unpublished manuscript.

Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible *input. Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 126-141.

Long, M. (1997). Construct validity in SLA research: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 318-323.

McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *3*, 577-608.

McNamara, T. (1997). What do we mean by social identity? Competing frameworks, competing Discourses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 561-567.

Maccoby, E. E. (1992). The role of parents in the socialization of children: An historical perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, *28*, 1006-1017.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, P. (1986). Teasing as language socialization and verbal play in a white working-class community. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 199-212). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Mohan, B., & Marshall-Smith, S. (1992). Context and cooperation in academic tasks. In D. Nunan (Ed.),

Collaborative language learning and teaching (pp. 81-99). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Mohatt, G., & Erickson, F. (1981). Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa school: A sociolinguistic approach. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie & K. H. P. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 105-119). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Moore, L. C. (1999). Language socialization research and French language education in Africa: A Cameroonian case study. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 329-350.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 279-310.

Ochs, E. (1986). From feelings to grammar: A Samoan case study. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 251-272). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology* (pp. 287-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1991). Socialization through language and interaction: A theoretical introduction. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*, 143-147.

Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *26*, 287-306.

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking* l*inguistic relativity* (pp. 407-437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1979). *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276-320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1995). The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *Handbook of child language* (pp. 73-94). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ogbu, J. (1996). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. In E. Jacob & C. Jordan (Eds.), *Minority Education: Anthropological Perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ohta, A. S. (1991). Evidentiality and politeness in Japanese. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*, 211-238.

Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of *Japanese. Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1493-1512.

Paugh, A. L. (1999). Language socialization in a multilingual Creole setting: Changing practices and ideologies in , Dominica W. I. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Stamford, CT, March, 1999.

Peters, A. M., & Boggs, S. T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 80-96). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian reservation*. New York: Longman.

Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *8*, 3-21.

Pierce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 9-31.

Platt, M. (1986). Social norms and lexical acquisition: A study of deictic verbs in Samoan child language. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 127-152). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Poole, D. (1990). Discourse analysis in ethnographic research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 11,* 42-56.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning, 42,* 593-616.

Rabain-Jamin, J. (1998). Polyadic language socialization: The case of toddlers in Senegal. *Discourse Processes, 26,* 43-65.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossings: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Roberts, C. (1998). Language acquisition or language socialization in and through discourse? Towards a redefinition of the domain of SLA. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 5,* 31-42. CALR. London: Thames Valley University.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rudolph, D. E. (1994). Constructing an apprenticeship with discourse strategies: Professor-graduate *student interactions. Language in Society, 23,* 199-230.

Rymes, B. (1997). Second language socialization: A new approach to second language acquisition *research. Journal of Intensive English Studies, 11,* 143-155.

Sapir, E. (1949). The status of linguistics as a science. In D. G. Mandelbaum (Ed.), *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality* (pp. 160-166). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schecter, S., & Bayley, R. (1997). Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly, 31,* 513-541.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1979). Getting it together: An ethnographic approach to the study of the development of communicative competence. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 73-108). New York: Academic Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1986). Teasing and shaming in Kaluli children's interactions. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs *(Eds.), Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 165-181). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Code-switching and language socialization: Some probable relationships. In J. F. Duchan, L. E. Hewitt, & R. M. Sonnemeier (Eds.), *Pragmatics: From theory to practice* (pp. 20-42). New York: Prentice Hall.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986a). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15,* 163-246.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986b). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1996). The microgenesis of competence: Methodology in language socialization. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language* (pp. 251-263). Mahwah, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Cambridge, MA:

Blackwe

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics, 17,* 356-382.

Smith-Hefner, N. J. (1988). The linguistic socialization of Javanese children in two communities. *Anthropological Linguistics, 30,* 166-198.

Suzuki, R. (1999). Language socialization through morphology: The affective suffix -CHAU in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31,* 1423-1441.

Toohey, K. (1998). "Breaking them up and taking them away": ESL students in Grade 1. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 61-84.

Tarone, E. (2000). Still wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage theory. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20,* 182-198.

Van Ness, H. (1981). Social control and social organization in an Alaskan Athabaskan classroom: A microethnography of "getting ready" for reading. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie & K. H. P. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 120-138). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Vasquez, O. A., Pease-Alvarez, L., & Shannon, S. M. (1994). *Pushing boundaries: Language and culture in a Mexican community*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1986). Calling-out and repeating routines in Kwara'ae children's language socialization. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 17-50). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wentworth, W. (1980). *Context and understanding: An inquiry into socialization theory*. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Willet, J. (1987). Contrasting acculturation patterns of two non-English -speaking preschoolers. In H. Trueba *(Ed.), Success or failure: Learning and the language minority student* (pp. 69-84). Cambridge: Newbury House.

Willett, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 757-761.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor. Lexington*, MA: D.C. Heath.

Wong-Filmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6,* 323-346.

Yoshimi, D. R. (1999). L1 language socialization as a variable in the use of ne by L2 learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31,* 1513-1525.

Young, R. (1999). Sociolinguistic approaches to SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 19,* 105-132.

Santoi Leung is a doctoral student in the Applied Linguistics Program at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her

research interests lie in the areas of discourse analysis of face-to-face interaction (in particular, the role of social context) and secondary language socialization. She is currently Paper Selection and Scheduling Co-chair for the NYSTESOL 2001 conference, and is also the Managing Editor of this journal.